

### **Remarks**

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application, and each was rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Specifically, the Examiner stated that claims 1-20 were unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,298 (Boggs et al.).

Filed with this amendment is a Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c). Because each of the claim rejections is based on obviousness-type double patenting, it is believed that the filing of the Terminal Disclaimer overcomes each of the claim rejections. Accordingly, allowance of each of the pending claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**David Lee Boggs et al.**

By Marc F. Malooley  
Marc F. Malooley  
Reg. No. 50,624  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: November 23, 2004

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400  
Fax: 248-358-3351